

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/243,101	SUSSER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan A. Vu	2193	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A. Vu. (3) _____.
 (2) Forrest Gunnison. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 July 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 59 and 69.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The interview was about putting the main methodologies underlying the reduction of unnecessary references of instructions to a constant pool in a runtime of a virtual machine of a resource restraint device; where 3,4 features have been proposed by Examiner for Applicant's representative to include in the main claims, e.g. 59 and 69. That is, the inlining of type operand, the creating of an opcode representing a family of opcodes for which references to a constant pool can be of different types, the forming of composite instructions; and explicit defining of 16-bit operands for arithmetic operation instructions that would otherwise require 32-bit storage in a runtime stack. These features have been mutually agreed upon; and thereby have put the invention in much improved state for allowance..